UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,860	10/15/2003	Brian D. Goodman	POU920030207US1	6687

7590 03/11/2008

John E. Campbell
IBM Corporation
2455 South Road, P386
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

EXAMINER	
WHIPPLE, BRIAN P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/685,860	**Applicant(s)** GOODMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Brian P. Whipple	**Art Unit** 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _22 January 2008_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-19,21-44,46-69 and 71-75_ is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-19,21-44,46-69 and 71-75_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _1/22/08_.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/22/08 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-19, 21-44, 46-69, and 71-75 are pending in this application and presented for examination. Claims 20, 45, and 70 have been cancelled by applicant's amendment filed on 1/22/08.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17, 21, 26-30, 32-36, 38-42, 46, 51-55, 57-61, 63-67, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (Gupta), U.S. Publication No. 2002/0099777 A1, in view of Gabber et al. (Gabber), further in view of what was well known in the art.

6. As to claim 1, Gupta discloses a method for creating a message at a first computer system for display on a second computer system ([0049], ln. 1-3; [0077], ln. 1-9), the method comprising the steps of:

initiating a request for a GUI message in response to an event ([0050], ln. 1-8; [0053], ln. 1-2; a request for the creation of a new message is sent to the email system in response to an event such as the user selecting a new message icon) wherein the event and the initiating of the request are external to the second computer system ([0050], ln. 1-8) wherein said message is a notification of said event ([0050], ln. 1-8; the creation of a new message is clearly an indication of an event, an event such as the user selecting an option to create a new message);

defining GUI message attributes ([0056], ln. 1-6);

defining GUI message functionality ([0055], ln. 20-25);

creating the message at the first computer system, the message comprising message content, the GUI message attributes and the GUI message functionality ([0049], ln. 1-3 and 6-12; [0055], ln. 20-25; [0056], ln. 1-6) such that the message includes aspects of how the second computer system is to display the message content ([0056], ln. 1-6); and

in response to the request, transmitting the message from the first computer system to a group of computer systems wherein the group of computer systems comprises the second computer system ([0064], ln. 1-9).

Gupta is silent on each computer system in said group of computer systems being anonymous to the first computer system and the other computer systems in said group of computer systems; and

each computer system in said group of computer systems having a filter for filtering said message for keywords of specific interest such that the message would have to pass the filter before the respective computer system sees the message.

However, Gabber discloses each computer system in said group of computer systems having a filter for filtering said message for keywords of specific interest such that the message would have to pass the filter before the respective computer system sees the message (Abstract; Col. 2, ln. 25-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta by using keyword filtering as is shown to be well known in the art by Gabber in order to sort email into desired and undesired categories.

Gupta and Gabber are silent on each computer system in said group of computer systems being anonymous to the first computer system and the other computer systems in said group of computer systems. (However, Gupta discloses anonymous comments as discussed in the previous Office action.)

Official Notice (see MPEP 2144.03) is taken that distribution lists, forum lists, mailing lists, etc. are all well known in the art and are defined by a single mailing address to which a sender may address an email. The sender sees only the distribution list name, but then the message is subsequently distributed to all subscribers to such a list.

7. As to claims 2, 9, 27, 34, 52, and 59, Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in the parent claim, including the attributes comprise background color (Gupta: [0056], ln. 1-6).

8. As to claims 3, 10, 28, 35, 53, and 60, Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in the parent claim, including the message is an alert message (Gupta: [0064]; any message is an alert message; recipients are alerted that the

message has been sent as well as being alerted regarding any information contained in the message itself) and the functionality comprises hyperlinks (Gupta: [0055], ln. 20-25).

9. As to claims 4, 11, 29, 36, 54, and 61, Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in the parent claim, including the content comprises text (Gupta: [0050], ln. 8-16; [0088], ln. 5-9).

10. As to claims 5, 30, and 55, Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in the parent claim, including the message further comprises routing information for any one of forwarding or acknowledging the message (Gupta: [0098], ln. 1-23).

11. As to claims 7, 13, 32, 38, 57, and 63, Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in the parent claim, including the message is initiated by user action (Gupta: [0050], ln. 1-8).

12. As to claim 8, the claim is rejected for similar reasons to claim 1 above. Gupta discloses a method for presenting a message received from a first computer system for display on a second computer system ([0077], ln. 1-9), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving the message from the first computer system at the second computer system ([0049], ln. 1-3; [0050], ln. 1-8; [0077], ln. 1-9) and wherein the message is notification of an event wherein the event is external to the second computer system ([0049], ln. 1-3; [0050], ln. 1-8; [0077], ln. 1-9), said message including aspects of how the second computer system is to display the message ([0056], ln. 1-6);

decoding the message at the second computer system, the decoding resulting in a format suitable for processing on second computer system ([0077], ln. 1-9; it is inherent that if the message is received and displayed that it was decoded into a format suitable for processing);

extracting said aspects including attributes, functionality and content from the message at the second computer system ([0055], ln. 20-25; [0056], ln. 1-6; [0077], ln. 6-9; [0078], ln. 1-7),

creating a user interactive GUI representation at the second computer system ([0077], ln. 1-9),

the user interactive GUI representation comprising one or more user input functions, the user input function selectable by a user ([0079], ln. 1-5),

the interactive GUI representation further comprising attributes, content and functionality defined by the extracted attributes, content and functionality of the message ([0055], ln. 20-25; [0056], ln. 1-6; [0077], ln. 6-9; [0078], ln. 1-7); and displaying the user interactive GUI representation at the second computer system ([0077], ln. 1-9).

Gupta is silent on each computer system in said group of computer systems being anonymous to the first computer system and the other computer systems in said group of computer systems; and

each computer system in said group of computer systems having a filter for filtering said message for keywords of specific interest such that the message would have to pass the filter before the respective computer system sees the message.

However, Gabber discloses each computer system in said group of computer systems having a filter for filtering said message for keywords of specific interest such that the message would have to pass the filter before the respective computer system sees the message (Abstract; Col. 2, ln. 25-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta by using keyword filtering as is shown to be well known in the art by Gabber in order to sort email into desired and undesired categories.

Gupta and Gabber are silent on each computer system in said group of computer systems being anonymous to the first computer system and the other computer systems in said group of computer systems. (However, Gupta discloses anonymous comments as discussed in the previous Office action.)

Official Notice (see MPEP 2144.03) is taken that distribution lists, forum lists, mailing lists, etc. are all well known in the art and are defined by a single mailing address to which a sender may address an email. The sender sees only the distribution list name, but then the message is subsequently distributed to all subscribers to such a list.

13. As to claims 14, 39, and 64, Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in the parent claim, including identifying routing information (Gupta: [0098], ln. 5-17).

14. As to claims 15, 40, and 65, Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in the parent claim, including modifying the GUI based on the routing information (Gupta: [0077], ln. 1-7).

15. As to claims 16, 41, and 66, Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in the parent claim, including launching an application program according to attributes of the message content (Gupta: [0070], ln. 1-5; [0072], ln. 1-2 and 8-17).

16. As to claims 17, 42, and 67, Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in the parent claim, including the attributes comprise any one of inline binary data, computer program instructions, rich media content, instructions for displaying the GUI, GUI display, size or shape (Gupta: [0072], ln. 1-2 and 8-17).

17. As to claims 21, 46, and 71, Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in the parent claim, including saving the message in a list view, the list view comprising history of messages (Gupta: Figure 5; [0055], ln. 6-10; [0070], ln. 1-5).

18. As to claim 26, Gupta discloses a system for creating a message at a first computer system for display on a second computer system ([0049], ln. 1-3; [0077], ln. 1-9), the system comprising:

a network ([0029], ln. 1-3);

the second computer system in communication with the network ([0034], ln. 1-3);

the first computer system in communication with the network ([0034], ln. 1-3; [0049], ln. 1-3), wherein the first computer system includes instructions to execute a method comprising:

initiating a request for a GUI message in response to an event wherein the event and the initiating of the request are external to the second computer system wherein said message is a notification of said event ([0050], ln. 1-8);

defining GUI message attributes ([0056], ln. 1-6);

defining GUI message functionality ([0055], ln. 20-25);

creating the message at the first computer system, the message comprising message content, the GUI message attributes and the GUI message functionality such that the message includes aspects of how the second computer system is to display the message content ([0049], ln. 1-3 and 6-12; [0055], ln. 20-25; [0056], ln. 1-6); and

in response to the request, transmitting the message from the first computer system to a group of computer systems wherein the group of computer systems comprises the second computer system ([0064], ln. 1-9).

Gupta is silent on each computer system in said group of computer systems being anonymous to the first computer system and the other computer systems in said group of computer systems; and

each computer system in said group of computer systems having a filter for filtering said message for keywords of specific interest such that the message would have to pass the filter before the respective computer system sees the message.

However, Gabber discloses each computer system in said group of computer systems having a filter for filtering said message for keywords of specific interest such that the message would have to pass the filter before the respective computer system sees the message (Abstract; Col. 2, ln. 25-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta by using keyword filtering as is shown to be well known in the art by Gabber in order to sort email into desired and undesired categories.

Gupta and Gabber are silent on each computer system in said group of computer systems being anonymous to the first computer system and the other computer systems in said group of computer systems. (However, Gupta discloses anonymous comments as discussed in the previous Office action.)

Official Notice (see MPEP 2144.03) is taken that distribution lists, forum lists, mailing lists, etc. are all well known in the art and are defined by a single mailing address to which a sender may address an email. The sender sees only the distribution list name, but then the message is subsequently distributed to all subscribers to such a list.

19. As to claim 33, Gupta discloses a system for presenting a message received from a first computer system for display on a second computer system ([0077], ln. 1-9), the system comprising:

a network ([0029], ln. 1-3);

the first computer system in communication with the network ([0034], ln. 1-3);

the second computer system in communication with the network ([0034], ln. 1-3; [0077], ln. 1-9), wherein the second computer system includes instructions to execute a method comprising:

receiving the message from the first computer system at the second computer system ([0049], ln. 1-3; [0050], ln. 1-8; [0077], ln. 1-9) and wherein the message is a notification of an event wherein the event is external to the second computer system ([0049], ln. 1-3; [0050], ln. 1-8; [0077], ln. 1-9), said message including aspects of how the second computer system is to display the message ([0056], ln. 1-6);

decoding the message at the second computer system, the decoding resulting in a format suitable for processing on second computer system ([0077], ln. 1-9; it is inherent that if the message is received and displayed that it was decoded into a format suitable for processing);

extracting said aspects including attributes, functionality and content from the message at the second computer system ([0055], ln. 20-25; [0056], ln. 1-6; [0077], ln. 6-9; [0078], ln. 1-7),

creating a user interactive GUI representation at the second computer system ([0077], ln. 1-9), the user interactive GUI representation comprising one or more user input functions, the user input function selectable by a user ([0079], ln. 1-5),

the interactive GUI representation further comprising attributes, content and functionality defined by the extracted attributes, content and functionality of the message ([0055], ln. 20-25; [0056], ln. 1-6; [0077], ln. 6-9; [0078], ln. 1-7); and

displaying the user interactive GUI representation at the second computer system ([0077], ln. 1-9).

Gupta is silent on each computer system in said group of computer systems being anonymous to the first computer system and the other computer systems in said group of computer systems; and

each computer system in said group of computer systems having a filter for filtering said message for keywords of specific interest such that the message would have to pass the filter before the respective computer system sees the message.

However, Gabber discloses each computer system in said group of computer systems having a filter for filtering said message for keywords of specific interest such that the message would have to pass the filter before the respective computer system sees the message (Abstract; Col. 2, ln. 25-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta by using keyword filtering as is shown to be well known in the art by Gabber in order to sort email into desired and undesired categories.

Gupta and Gabber are silent on each computer system in said group of computer systems being anonymous to the first computer system and the other computer systems in said group of computer systems. (However, Gupta discloses anonymous comments as discussed in the previous Office action.)

Official Notice (see MPEP 2144.03) is taken that distribution lists, forum lists, mailing lists, etc. are all well known in the art and are defined by a single mailing address to which a sender may address an email. The sender sees only the distribution list name, but then the message is subsequently distributed to all subscribers to such a list.

20. As to claim 51, Gupta discloses a computer program product for creating a message at a first computer system for display on a second computer system ([0049], ln. 1-3; [0077], ln. 1-9), the computer program product comprising:

a storage medium readable by a processing circuit and storing instructions for execution by the processing circuit for performing a method comprising (Pg. 19, right column, ln. 39-46):

initiating a request for a GUI message in response to an event wherein the event and the initiating of the request are external to the second computer system wherein said message is a notification of said event ([0050], ln. 1-8);

defining GUI message attributes ([0056], ln. 1-6);

defining GUI message functionality ([0055], ln. 20-25);

creating the message at the first computer system, the message comprising message content, the GUI message attributes and the GUI message functionality such that the message includes aspects of how the message content is to be displayed on the second computer system ([0049], ln. 1-3 and 6-12; [0055], ln. 20-25; [0056], ln. 1-6); and

in response to the request, transmitting the message from the first computer system to a group of computer systems wherein the group of computer systems comprises the second computer system ([0064], ln. 1-9).

Gupta is silent on each computer system in said group of computer systems being anonymous to the first computer system and the other computer systems in said group of computer systems; and

each computer system in said group of computer systems having a filter for filtering said message for keywords of specific interest such that the message would have to pass the filter before the respective computer system sees the message.

However, Gabber discloses each computer system in said group of computer systems having a filter for filtering said message for keywords of specific interest such that the message would have to pass the filter before the respective computer system sees the message (Abstract; Col. 2, ln. 25-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta by using keyword filtering as is shown to be well known in the art by Gabber in order to sort email into desired and undesired categories.

Gupta and Gabber are silent on each computer system in said group of computer systems being anonymous to the first computer system and the other computer systems in said group of computer systems. (However, Gupta discloses anonymous comments as discussed in the previous Office action.)

Official Notice (see MPEP 2144.03) is taken that distribution lists, forum lists, mailing lists, etc. are all well known in the art and are defined by a single mailing address to which a sender may address an email. The sender sees only the distribution list name, but then the message is subsequently distributed to all subscribers to such a list.

21. As to claim 58, Gupta discloses a computer program product for presenting a message received from a first computer system for display on a second computer system ([0077], ln. 1-9), the computer program product comprising:

a storage medium readable by a processing circuit and storing instructions for execution by the processing circuit for performing a method comprising (Pg. 19, right column, ln. 39-46):

receiving the message from the first computer system at the second computer system ([0049], ln. 1-3; [0050], ln. 1-8; [0077], ln. 1-9) and wherein the message is a notification of an event wherein the event is external to the second computer system ([0049], ln. 1-3; [0050], ln. 1-8; [0077], ln. 1-9), said message including aspects of how the second computer system is to display the message ([0056], ln. 1-6);

decoding the message at the second computer system, the decoding resulting in a format suitable for processing on second computer system ([0077], ln. 1-9; it is inherent that if the message is received and displayed that it was decoded into a format suitable for processing);

extracting said aspects including attributes, functionality and content from the message at the second computer system ([0055], ln. 20-25; [0056], ln. 1-6; [0077], ln. 6-9; [0078], ln. 1-7),

creating a user interactive GUI representation at the second computer system ([0077], ln. 1-9),

the user interactive GUI representation comprising one or more user input functions, the user input function selectable by a user ([0079], ln. 1-5), the interactive GUI representation further comprising attributes, content and functionality defined by the extracted attributes, content and functionality of the message ([0055], ln. 20-25; [0056], ln. 1-6; [0077], ln. 6-9; [0078], ln. 1-7); and

displaying the user interactive GUI representation at the second computer system ([0077], ln. 1-9).

Gupta is silent on each computer system in said group of computer systems being anonymous to the first computer system and the other computer systems in said group of computer systems; and

each computer system in said group of computer systems having a filter for filtering said message for keywords of specific interest such that the message would have to pass the filter before the respective computer system sees the message.

However, Gabber discloses each computer system in said group of computer systems having a filter for filtering said message for keywords of specific interest such that the message would have to pass the filter before the respective computer system sees the message (Abstract; Col. 2, ln. 25-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta by using keyword filtering as is shown to be well known in the art by Gabber in order to sort email into desired and undesired categories.

Gupta and Gabber are silent on each computer system in said group of computer systems being anonymous to the first computer system and the other computer systems in said group of computer systems. (However, Gupta discloses anonymous comments as discussed in the previous Office action.)

Official Notice (see MPEP 2144.03) is taken that distribution lists, forum lists, mailing lists, etc. are all well known in the art and are defined by a single mailing address to which a sender may address an email. The sender sees only the distribution list name, but then the message is subsequently distributed to all subscribers to such a list.

22. Claims 6, 12, 31, 37, 56, and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art, further in view of Jannu et al. (Jannu), U.S. Patent No. 7,152,094 B1.

23. As to claims 6, 12, 31, 37, 56, and 62, Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art do not disclose the message is transmitted to the group by way of a pub/sub service.

However, Jannu does disclose the message is transmitted to the group by way of a pub/sub service (Col. 2, ln. 11-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art by utilizing a pub/sub service as taught by Jannu in order to ensure that messages reach an interested audience and unwanted messages are not received (Jannu: Col. 2, ln. 22-25).

24. Claims 18, 43, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art, further in view of Walker et al. (Walker), U.S. Patent No. 6,286,001 B1.

25. As to claims 18, 43, and 68, Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art do not disclose the attributes identify preferred input types, the types comprising any one of keyboard, mouse, voice, biometric system, application program interface or network attached device.

However, Walker does disclose the attributes identify preferred input types, the types comprising any one of keyboard, mouse, voice, biometric system, application program interface or network attached device (Col. 9, ln. 50-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art by utilizing preferred input types as taught by Walker in order to disable unapproved functions and/or enable approved functions (Walker, Col. 9, ln. 50-52) and prevent the user from accessing unauthorized data (Walker, Col. 4, ln. 5-16).

26. Claims 19, 44, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art, in view of Microsoft Corporation (Microsoft), Internet Explorer 4.0 Accessibility, October 1997.

27. As to claims 19, 44, and 69, Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art do not disclose the GUI display is overridden by local GUI settings.

However, Microsoft does disclose the GUI display is overridden by local GUI settings (Pg. 5, ln. 3-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art by allowing local GUI settings to override the GUI display as taught by Microsoft in order to allow the user to customize the GUI to his or her own accessibility needs (Microsoft, Pg. 2, ln. 7-10).

28. Claims 22-23, 47-48, and 72-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art, further in view of Nemovicher, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0007453 A1.

29. As to claims 22, 47, and 72, Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art do not disclose the further step of pre-processing the message before the creating the GUI step.

However, Nemovicher does disclose the further step of pre-processing the message before the creating the GUI step ([0020], ln. 1-4; [0058], ln. 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art by pre-processing the message before creating the GUI as taught by Nemovicher in order to ensure that recipients do not receive messages that may contain viruses (Nemovicher, [0020], ln. 17-19).

30. As to claims 23, 48, and 73, Nemovicher further discloses pre-processing comprises virus scanning the message ([0020], ln. 1-4; [0058], ln. 1-5).

31. Claims 24-25, 49-50, and 74-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art, further in view of McCormick et al. (McCormick), U.S. Patent No. 6,421,709 B1.

32. As to claims 24, 49, and 74, Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art do not disclose the further step of post-processing the message after the creating the step.

However, McCormick does disclose the further step of post-processing the message after the creating the step (Col. 8, ln. 48-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gupta, Gabber, and what was well known in the art by post-processing the message as taught by McCormick in order to teach a system to filter junk mail (McCormick, Col. 8, ln. 48-55).

33. As to claims 25, 50, and 75, McCormick further discloses post-processing comprises generating SPAM identification heuristics (Col. 8, ln. 48-55).

Conclusion

34. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

35. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Whipple whose telephone number is (571)270-1244. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian P. Whipple
/B. P. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 2152
2/27/08

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152